

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed July 18, 2006 has been carefully considered. Within the Office Action Claim 29 has been rejected and 30-45 have been objected to. In addition, Claims 46-48 have been allowed. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**Judicially-created Double Patenting**

Claim 29 stands rejected pursuant to the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 prior United States patent No. 6,258,271. Submitted herewith is a Terminal Disclaimer executed by Applicant's attorney or record. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 30-45 are dependent on Claim 29. Considering that Claim 29 is now in a condition for allowance, Claims 30-45 are allowable for being dependent on a base claim. Applicants kindly request allowance of Claims 30-45.

Conclusion

It is believed that this reply places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this reply is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

THELEN REID & PRIEST, LLP

Dated: 10/18/06

  
Suvashis Bhattacharya  
Reg. No. 46,554

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP  
P.O. Box 640640  
San Jose, CA 95164-0640  
Tel. (408) 292-5800  
Fax. (408) 287-8040